

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 25 2004

JOSEPH T. VAN LEEUWEN

ATTORNEY AT LAW

REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY

6123 PEBBLE GARDEN CT.
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78739TELEPHONE: (512) 301-6738
FACSIMILE: (512) 301-6742
jtv@austin.rr.com**OFFICIAL****Fax**

To: EXAMINER LU From: Joseph T. Van Leeuwen

Fax: 703-746-9694 Pages: (including this page)

Phone: 703-305-4894 Date:

Re: 09/895,891 Agenda CC:

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

• Comments:

See Attached.

I tried to EMAIL THIS TO
YOU YESTERDAY BUT THE MAIL
WAS RETURNED BY USPTO'S
MAIL SERVER.

Thanks,

Joe

Warning: The information contained in this facsimile is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipient(s) named above. This facsimile may be an attorney-client communication, may be protected by the work product doctrine, and may be subject to a protective order. As such, this document is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this document is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this message in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and e-mail and destroy any and all copies of this facsimile in your possession (whether hard copies or electronically stored copies).

Joseph Van Leeuwen

From: Joseph Van Leeuwen [jvl@austin.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 22, 2004 7:53 PM
To: 'klu@uspto.gov'
Subject: 09/895,891 - Interview Agenda

Examiner Lu:

I have reviewed the relevant portions of the art cited (Oracle manual by Cafolla et al.) and would like to discuss my interpretation of the art with you.

Also, my copy of Cafolla that I received from the PTO is missing page 2-38, all other cited pages were present in the copy that I received. Would you mind faxing me a copy of page 2-38 so that I can review it? Thanks. My fax number is listed at the bottom of this note.

I would like to discuss the rejection of Claim 1. In particular, Cafolla does not seem to be teaching the "exclusion" of one or more employees from one view (the first view) to the second view, as claimed by Applicants.

Regarding claim 1, my reading of Cafolla is as follows:

1. page 13-2 cited in the Office Action as teaching the selection of people from a first view to exclude in a second view. The cited section of Cafolla allows a user to select a viewed person in order to view more information about the selected person. It does not select people from one view to exclude in a second view.
2. page 13-3 and 8-8 in the Office Action as teaching "excluding the employee profile information... resulting in a second view" My reading of this section of Cafolla is that Cafolla allows the user to select certain fields to be displayed in a second view, but does not allow the exclusion of certain employees from the second view. This reading of Cafolla is consistent on both pages 13-3 and 8-8.
3. page 34-15 of Cafolla is cited in the Office Action as teaching "granting view access to the second view..." While 34-15 does teach the granting of permissions, it does not teach that permissions are granted to any views that resulted from the preceding cited steps identified in paragraphs 1 & 2, above. Rather, 34-15 simply states that permissions are granted on "secure views of those tables." Furthermore, I did not see that the above-cited sections of Cafolla taught the creation of any "secured views" Rather, the above sections allow a user to "drill down" into an employee's record to view various fields pertaining to the employee, without creating a "secured view" of the employee.

I would like to discuss your interpretation of Cafolla and, in particular, understand why you felt that Cafolla taught the "exclusion" of employees from a first view to a second view, as taught by Applicants. My overall impression is that Cafolla allows the user to drill down and exclude or include certain fields that he/she would like to view regarding an employee, but does not allow the user to create a "secure view" (term used by Cafolla) based upon one view that excludes employees from appearing in a second secured view.

Thanks,
Joe

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
ph. (512) 301-6738
fax (512) 301-6742